

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 1-30 are pending, Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15, 16-19, 23-26 and 30 having been amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1-3, 8-10, 15-18, 23-25 and 30 were indicated as being anticipated by Wu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,551) and Claims 4-7, 11-14, 19-22 and 26-29 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the identification of allowable subject matter. In reply, Claims 4-7, 11-14, 19-22 and 26-29 have been placed in allowable form by rewriting Claims 4, 11, 19 and 26 in independent form, incorporating the features of the base claim and intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify what is being claimed in the information providing apparatus. It is believed that perhaps the original wording of Claim 1 caused some confusion during examination, because it is Applicants' belief that Wu is not an anticipatory reference of original Claim 1, as well as amended Claim 1. Furthermore, Claim 1 has been amended to avoid an interpretation under 35 USC §112, paragraph 6.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to an information providing apparatus comprising a reception mechanism that is configured to receive a request message from a terminal. The request message identifies a key server and a key associated with predetermined content. The information providing apparatus also includes a controller configured to control whether to request the key from the key server based on the request message, so that the key server releases the key for use by the terminal, when the controller makes the request. Support for amended Claim 1 is found in original Claim 1, as well as in the specification in numerous places, for example the discussion beginning at page 31. Thus no new matter is added.

An advantage with the presently claimed invention is that it allows for devices that have relatively small processing speeds to nevertheless benefit from providing quick content downloading, while still reliably preventing unauthorized content usage.

Wu is directed to a pluggable account management interface that among other things uses single-sign-on (SSO) authentication. An account management interface 123 interfaces with an authentication service 109 and system entry service 107 (referring to Figure 2 as an example). When a user accesses or requests authorization service to log on, the account management interface 123 requests a token from the user. Subsequently the request authentication service 109 sets a credential and the credential is then used when other authentication services are requested. Moreover, Wu uses “token mapping” which allows stacked authentication service 109 to assign only one unique authentication token for a user. The user’s token is used to encrypt the user’s other secondary authentication tokens (see e.g. column 10, lines 37-49). An advantage with this system is that a single user needs to only remember or provide a single authentication token when attempting to connect to a computer 101.

Comparing amended Claim 1 with Wu, amended Claim 1 requires a reception mechanism that is configured to receive a request message from a terminal where the request message identifies a key server and a key associated with a predetermined content. The outstanding Office Action cited column 15, lines 54-63 for this feature, however this passage in Wu refers to the use of various encryption algorithms or “encrypted key based mechanisms” to provide authentication service. However, this feature in Wu neither teaches nor suggests a reception mechanism that receives a request message from a terminal where the request message identifies the key server and key associated with predetermined content. Furthermore, Claim 1, as amended, requires a controller that is configured to control whether to request the key from the key server based on the request message so that the key server

releases the key for use by the terminal when the controller makes the request. This feature is simply absent in Wu. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 patentably defines over Wu. Although Claims 2-3, 8-10, 15-18, 23-25 and 30 are of differing scope and/or statutory class, it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentably define over Wu for substantially the same reasons as discussed above with regard to amended Claim 1.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, indication of allowable subject matter, and in light of the foregoing comments it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-30, as amended, patentably defines over the asserted prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073

BDL\la
I:\ATTY\BDL\204272US\204272US-AM.DOC

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866